

WATSON LEAVENWORTH KELTON & TAGGART
100 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK 10017

LESLIE D. TAGGART
ELMER R. HELFERICH
NORMAN N. SCHUTTLE
JOHN T. KELTON
NICHOLAS JOHN STATHIS
WILLIAM H. VOGT III
HERBERT BLECKER
HOWARD K. KOTHE
ALBERT ROBIN
THOMAS V. HEYMAN
ROBERT E. KOSINSKI
STEVEN J. BOSSES
GEORGE J. BRANDT, JR.
JAMES J. DALEY
FRANK J. COLUCCI
GEORGE W. MACDONALD JR.

JAMES W. BADIE
ROBERT J. EICHELBERG
ROBERT M. FREEMAN
MAXIM H. WALDBAUM
PAUL E. O'DONNELL, JR.
PHILIP M. FRENCH
PETER G. DILWORTH
FRANKLIN A. BONIN

LEONARD A. WATSON (1930-1960)
ELLIS W. LEAVENWORTH (1930-1959)

(AREA CODE 212)
683-4220

CABLE ADDRESS "WATSOLAW"

INTERNATIONAL TELEX
620866

December 4, 1974

Dr. G. Esler Inskip
Assistant Patent Officer
Philip Morris Incorporated
Research Center, P.O. Box 26583
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Re: Our File 582-808
PM #626

Dear Les:

Attached hereto is a draft relating to the above-identified subject matter.

As you will see, the draft contains a number of blank spaces and may contain statements which do not accurately reflect the inventors' concept of their invention. Accordingly, the draft should be carefully reviewed by the inventors and others concerned.

There are a number of questions which have arisen in connection with the preparation of this application and it would be helpful to receive your comments and those of the inventors and others concerned with regard to these questions.

1. With regard to the prior art, do you feel that we have now set forth all the art which is pertinent to this subject? And can we provide additional language to distinguish the present invention over:

(a) a carbonization process, such as is set forth in Siegel?

(b) a degradation process such as is set forth in the ICI patents?

C
O
P
Y

2026460676

Dr. G. Esler Inskeep

-2-

December 4, 1974

(c) a degradation process such as is set forth in the Sutton patents?

(d) an oxidation process, such as is set forth in the patents involving oxidized cellulose?

2. Do any of the formulations which are set forth in the examples correspond or relate to preferred tobacco substitute materials which have not yet been covered by patent applications (e.g. 582-818, PM #641)?

3. Are the carbohydrate materials which have been set forth as being appropriate for ozone treatment adequately characterized? In this connection, will the ozone treatment work for all of the materials which are set forth, for example, in the prior art patents discussed above and will they work for materials not disclosed in such patents? Will they work in connection with carbohydrate materials other than polysaccharides, for example, di- or trisaccharides and is the only reason for limiting the concept to that of polysaccharides one of film formation? In this connection, could an ozone treatment be employed for lower molecular weight materials which would require some sort of basis or substrate in order to be employed?

4. Can we amplify the description relating to ozone generation in terms of other means of generation, etc.?

It will be very helpful to be able to demonstrate that the mechanism of the present process differs from the prior art methods. Can we establish that the resultant product differs chemically and/or physically from the other products which have been produced by the treatments of the prior art and can we demonstrate, objectively and/or subjectively, the greater desirability of the products of the present invention over the products of the prior art?

Please note that the present claim structure is tentative and that it will probably be necessary to modify the claims in accordance with the answers and comments which are received from the inventors.

We look forward to receiving your comments, together with those of the inventors and others concerned.

Sincerely,

Howard K. Kothe

HKK:gbs
Enc.

C
O
P
Y

2026460677